

Application Serial No. 10/644,785  
Applicant: Takahiro AMANAI  
Filing Date: August 21, 2003  
Docket No.: 12577/20

### REMARKS

Claims 1-2 and 4-12 remain in the application. Claim 3 has been canceled and its limitations added to claim 1. Claim 11 and 12 are amended to clarify language in the claims and overcome the Examiner's objections to those claims. All claims stand rejected as anticipated by JP2003029343 A and as obvious over a combination of references. Claims 1, 2 and 6-8 are also rejected as anticipated by Ono '677. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections in view of the remarks below.

#### Priority

The Examiner has acknowledged a priority claim that has not been made. The box "Priority not Claimed" on the declaration is checked. The present application is based on JP2003029343 A, but since it was filed more than a year after the filing of that application, priority was not claimed. Thus, no certified copy is required.

#### The Section 102 Rejection Based on JP2003029343 A

The present application is being made with the same named inventor as JP2003029343 A. The computer translation which the Examiner has translated Mr. Amanai's name improperly. A declaration from the inventor to this effect is enclosed. Thus, this rejection should be withdrawn. As the Examiner recognizes in making a rejection under section 102(a), rather than 102(b), the present application was filed within a year of the publication date of JP2003029343 A.

#### The Section 102 Rejection Based on Ono'677

Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of original claim 3. Accordingly, claim 3 is cancelled. Furthermore, claim 1 is limited to recite a main body in which the display element, the projecting optical system and the diffusive hologram screen are arranged. In addition, the amended claim recites that the main body has a grip portion to allow an operator to hold the main body in front of the operator. The specification describes, for example, at page 24, lines 12-15, that the main body can be gripped. Accordingly, it is clear that the apparatus of the present invention has a grip portion. In addition, FIG. 15 shows that the apparatus is held in front of the operator. Thus, this amendment is supported by the original disclosure.

Application Serial No. 10/644,785  
Applicant: Takahiro AMANAI  
Filing Date: August 21, 2003  
Docket No.: 12577/20

Original claims 1-2 and 6-8 were rejected as anticipated by Ono '677. Ono '677 discloses a holographic display device. In paragraph [0018], Ono '677 teaches that the holographic display device can be used for a CD machine in a bank or a shop window. However, Ono '677 fails to disclose that the main body is provided with "the image display element, the projecting optical system and the diffusive hologram screen", and further, "the grip portion to allow the operator to hold the main body in front of the operator." Furthermore, Ono '677 fails to disclose the numerical conditions called out in the claim. (the Examiner recognized this when he did not reject claim 3 as anticipated by Ono). For these reasons, amended claim 1 is not anticipated by Ono '677. Nor are claims 2 and 6-8, which depend from claim 1, anticipated by Ono '677.

#### The Section 103 Rejections

##### Claim 3

As stated above, the subject matter of original claim 3 is incorporated into claim 1. Original claim 3 was rejected as unpatentable over Ono '677 in view of Ono '461. Ono '461 discloses a holographic display device. Also, Ono '461 discloses a configuration in which a diffusion hologram is provided on the wind-proof glass 1 of a vehicle (FIGS. 1, 6, and 14) and a configuration in which the diffusion hologram is provided on the glass 63 of a show window. However, in connection with the wind-proof glass 1 of a vehicle or the glass 63 of a show window, there is no disclosure or suggestion that the main body is provided with "the image display element, the projecting optical system and the diffusive hologram screen".

Furthermore, the wind-proof glass 1 of a vehicle or the glass 63 of a show window is not able to be gripped by the operator. Therefore, Ono '461 fails to disclose or suggest "a grip portion to allow an operator to hold the main body in front of the operator".

Ono '461 discloses, in FIG.7, the characteristic satisfying the numerical condition recited in claim 1. However, the numerical condition of amended claim 1 has been determined in consideration that the main body is held by the operator in front of the operator. Therefore, it is difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art to derive from Ono '461, which does not disclose "a

Application Serial No. 10/644,785  
Applicant: Takahiro AMANAI  
Filing Date: August 21, 2003  
Docket No.: 12577/20

grip portion to allow an operator to hold the main body in front of the operator,” the proper numerical condition for an image display apparatus to be used when it is held in the hand.

In summary, neither Ono ‘677 nor Ono ‘461 discloses or suggests a main body provided with “the display element, the projecting optical system and the diffusive hologram screen” or “a grip portion to allow an operator to hold the main body in front of the operator” or a condition determined in consideration that the image display apparatus is used as being held in hand of the operator, that is, the numerical condition of claim 1. Therefore, one combining the teaching of these references would not be led to what is claimed in claim 1. As a result, claim 1 is not obvious over the combination of Ono ‘677 and Ono ‘461. Claims 2 and 6-8 depend from claim 1 and thus are also not obvious in view of these references either alone or in combination.

#### Claim 4

Claim 4 was rejected as being unpatentable over Ono ‘677 in view of Kanda et al. As discussed above, Ono ‘677 fails to disclose the features of the present invention recited in claim 1, that is, that the main body is provided with “the display element, the projecting optical system and the diffusive hologram screen” and “a grip portion to allow an operator to hold the main body in front of the operator”. In addition, Ono ‘677 fails to disclose the numerical condition recited in claim 1 or the numerical condition recited in claim 4.

Kanda discloses a display device using a hologram (FIGS. 32, 34, 37 and 38). However, in the display device of Kanda, there is no disclosure or suggestion that the main body is provided with “the image display element, the projecting optical system and the diffusive hologram screen”, and further that, “the grip portion to allow the operator to hold the main body in front of the operator”. In addition, Kanda fails to disclose a condition determined in consideration that the image display apparatus is used when being held in the hand of an operator, that is, the numerical condition of claim 1.

Kanda shows, in FIG. 37, a configuration that satisfies the numerical condition recited in claim 4. However, the numerical condition of claim 4 has been determined in consideration of the fact that the main body is held by an operator in front of the operator. Therefore, it is difficult for one of ordinary skill in the art to get any teaching from Kanda, which fails to

Application Serial No. 10/644,785  
Applicant: Takahiro AMANAI  
Filing Date: August 21, 2003  
Docket No.: 12577/20

disclose “a grip portion to allow an operator to hold the main body in front of the operator,” concerning a proper numerical condition for an image display apparatus that is held in the hand is to be used.

From the discussion above, it is clear that neither Ono ‘677 nor Kanda discloses or suggests a main body provided with “the display element, the projecting optical system and the diffusive hologram screen” and “a grip portion to allow an operator to hold the main body in front of the operator” or a condition determined in consideration of the fact that the image display apparatus is used when it is being held in the hand of an operator, that is, the numerical condition of claim 1. Furthermore, neither Ono ‘677 or Kanda discloses or suggests the condition of claim 4, also determined in consideration of the fact that the image display apparatus is used when it is held in the hand.

Therefore, absent such teaching or suggestion, Applicant submits that claim 4 is not obvious from the combination of Ono ‘677 and Kanda.

#### Claim 5

Claim 5 was rejected as being unpatentable over Ono ‘677 in view of Seufert. As discussed above, Ono ‘677 fails to disclose the features of the present invention recited in claim 1, that is, that the main body is provided with “the display element, the projecting optical system and the diffusive hologram screen” and “a grip portion to allow an operator to hold the main body in front of the operator”. In addition, Ono ‘677 fails to disclose the numerical condition recited in claim 1.

Seufert discloses a rear projection module (FIG. 9). Here, Seufert discloses a projection module 1 provided with a picture generator 15, a projecting lens 33 and a projection screen 2. However, Seufert fails to disclose that the projection screen 2 is a diffusion hologram. That is, Seufert fails to disclose that the main body is provided with “the image display element, the projecting optical system and the diffusive hologram screen”. Furthermore, Seufert fails to disclose “the grip portion to allow the operator to hold the main body in front of the operator”. In addition, Seufert fails to disclose a condition determined in consideration of the fact that the

Application Serial No. 10/644,785  
Applicant: Takahiro AMANAI  
Filing Date: August 21, 2003  
Docket No.: 12577/20

image display apparatus is held in the hand of the operator, that is, the numerical condition of claim 1.

Again summarizing, neither Ono '677 nor Seufert discloses or suggests a main body provided with "the display element, the projecting optical system and the diffusive hologram screen" and "a grip portion to allow an operator to hold the main body in front of the operator" or a condition determined in consideration that the image display apparatus is used as being held in hand of the operator, that is, the numerical condition of claim 1.

Therefore, claim 5 is not obvious from the combination of Ono '677 and Seufert.

Claim 9:

Claim 9 was rejected as unpatentable over Ono '677 in view of Hildebrand et al. As discussed above, Ono '677 fails to disclose the features of the present invention recited in claim 1, that is, that the main body is provided with "the display element, the projecting optical system and the diffusive hologram screen" and "a grip portion to allow an operator to hold the main body in front of the operator". In addition, Ono '677 fails to disclose the numerical condition recited in claim 1.

Hildebrand et al. disclose a micro display 12, a synthesizing optic 24, and a second magnification optic 36. While Hildebrand et al. disclose use of a diffractive optic as the synthesizing optic 24, they fail to disclose use of a diffusion hologram. That is, Hildebrand et al. fail to disclose that the main body is provided with "the image display element, the projecting optical system and the diffusive hologram screen." Furthermore, Hildebrand et al. fail to disclose "the grip portion to allow the operator to hold the main body in front of the operator". In addition, Hildebrand et al. fail to disclose a condition determined in consideration that the image display apparatus being held in hand of the operator, that is, the numerical condition of claim 1.

Once again, neither Ono '677 nor Hildebrand et al. disclose or suggest a main body provided with "the display element, the projecting optical system and the diffusive hologram screen" and "a grip portion to allow an operator to hold the main body in front of the operator"

Application Serial No. 10/644,785  
Applicant: Takahiro AMANAI  
Filing Date: August 21, 2003  
Docket No.: 12577/20

or a condition determined in consideration that the image display apparatus is used as being held in hand of the operator, that is, the numerical condition of claim 1.

Therefore, claim 9 is would not have been obvious from the combination of Ono '677 and Hildebrand et al.

#### Claim 10

Claim 10 was rejected as unpatentable over Ono '677 in view of Hockley. As discussed above, Ono '677 fails to disclose the features of the present invention recited in claim 1, that is, that the main body is provided with "the display element, the projecting optical system and the diffusive hologram screen" and "a grip portion to allow an operator to hold the main body in front of the operator". In addition, Ono '677 fails to disclose the numerical condition recited in claim 1.

Hockley discloses a slide 22, a lens 24 and a holographic diffuser 50. However, Hockley does not disclose a specific structure of the entire apparatus. That is, Hockley fails to disclose that the main body is provided with "the image display element, the projecting optical system and the diffusive hologram screen." Furthermore, Hockley fails to disclose "the grip portion to allow the operator to hold the main body in front of the operator." In addition, Hockley fails to disclose a condition determined in consideration of the image display apparatus being held in hand of the operator during use, that is, the numerical condition of claim 1.

As discussed above, neither Ono '677 nor Hockley discloses or suggests a main body provided with "the display element, the projecting optical system and the diffusive hologram screen" and "a grip portion to allow an operator to hold the main body in front of the operator" or a condition determined in consideration of the image display apparatus being held in hand of the operator during use, that is, the numerical condition of claim 1.

Therefore, claim 10 would not have been obvious from the combination of Ono '677 and Hockley.

#### Claims 11-12

Application Serial No. 10/644,785  
Applicant: Takahiro AMANAI  
Filing Date: August 21, 2003  
Docket No.: 12577/20

Claims 11 and 12 were rejected as unpatentable over Ono '677 in view of Hildebrand et al. As discussed above, Ono '677 fails to disclose the features of the present invention recited in claim 1, that is, that the main body is provided with "the display element, the projecting optical system and the diffusive hologram screen" and "a grip portion to allow an operator to hold the main body in front of the operator". In addition, Ono '677 fails to disclose the numerical condition recited in claim 1.

Hildebrand et al. disclose a micro display 12, a synthesizing optic 24, and a second magnification optic 36. While Hildebrand et al. disclose use of a diffractive optic as the synthesizing optic 24, they fail to disclose use of a diffusion hologram. That is, Hildebrand et al. fail to disclose that the main body is provided with "the image display element, the projecting optical system and the diffusive hologram screen." Furthermore, Hildebrand et al. fail to disclose "the grip portion to allow the operator to hold the main body in front of the operator". In addition, Hildebrand et al. fail to disclose a condition determined in consideration of the fact that the image display apparatus is used when held in hand of the operator, that is, the numerical condition of claim 1.

Thus, neither Ono '677 nor Hildebrand et al. disclose or suggest a main body provided with "the display element, the projecting optical system and the diffusive hologram screen" and "a grip portion to allow an operator to hold the main body in front of the operator" or a condition determined in view of the image display apparatus being held in hand of the operator during use, that is, the numerical condition of claim 1.

Therefore, claims 11 and 12 are not obvious from the combination of Ono '677 and Hildebrand et al.

In view of the above, Applicant submits that all remaining claims are in condition for allowance, prompt notice of which is respectfully solicited.


The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (202) 220-4200 to discuss any information concerning this application.

Application Serial No. 10/644,785  
Applicant: Takahiro AMANAI  
Filing Date: August 21, 2003  
Docket No.: 12577/20

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 11-0600 (Referencing Docket 12577/20).

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 04, 2006

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
John C. Altmiller  
Registration No. 25,951

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Tel.: (202) 220-4200  
Fax.: (202) 220-4201